UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/610,690	06/30/2003	Charles J. Levine	MSFT-1797 (303687.01)	2925
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			STACE, BRENT S	
2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/610,690	LEVINE ET AL.		
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	BRENT STACE	2161		
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>RC</u>	<u>E</u>		
(1) <u>BRENT STACE</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Kenneth Eiferman</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: 12 August 2010	Time: <u>2:05pm EST</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A				
Claims discussed: 1, 11, 20, 21				
Prior art documents discussed: N/A				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand 	he examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/BRENT STACE/ Examiner, Art Unit 2161	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner requested clarity on claims 1 and 21 regarding exactly what is inputted and outputted from the deterministic data generation module and how the 2nd seed is "determined" for an attempt to allow the case. Also, the examiner requested support for these clarifying amendments and the amendments submitted 6/1/10 and identified 112 2nd paragraph rejections for Claim 9 and 10 that are warranted by the amendments to the claims submitted 6/1/10. Finally, the examiner identified Claims 11 and 20 as not appearing ready for allowance. The attorney disired to see a written office action instead of resolving issues on the phone.